

District Planning Committee

Minutes

October 29, 2008

LACCD Board Room

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:38 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

The Minutes of the DPC meeting held on September 24, 2008 were reviewed and approved with minor changes.

Calendar of College Strategic Plan Presentations to the BOT

G. Colombo updated the committee on the Board's decision, taken during the October 22, 2008 Committee of the Whole, to postpone the Cityside College Strategic Plan presentations. Committee members then discussed the proposal to modify the plan for these presentations that was originally approved by the DPC on 5/29/08. It was agreed to alter the original plan which called for three colleges to present to the Board during 1 1/2—2 hour Committee of the Whole sessions. Instead, committee members agreed to recommend to the Board that the colleges present their strategic plans and/or educational master plans to the Board Committee on Planning and Student Success as these plans are revised, and that during these presentations the colleges should be expected to do the following, as agreed in the 5/29/08 design of this process:

1. Report on college ARCC outcomes
2. Report on the progress made on past strategic and ed plan goals and objectives
3. Report on college efforts in support of the District Strategic Plan
4. Discuss current challenges and opportunities
5. Present future goals and objectives

This recommendation was made to allow for a more in-depth discussion of college progress and future plans. It was also made in recognition of the role of the Board's Committee on Planning and Student Success. The recommendation will be taken to this committee of the Board when it meets in December to review the accreditation self studies of the Cityside colleges.

In the meantime, it was agreed that the DPC would update its Strategic/Ed Master Plan calendar, so that this could be shared with the Board in December. A quick survey of the group suggested that at least three colleges expect to complete plan revisions in early 2009—LACC, LASC, and LAMC. During the ensuing discussion it was noted that colleges across the state are tending to move toward a shorter timeframe for strategic planning—and that some are now updating their plans annually.

Web-Based Program Review Models

The committee was offered demonstrations of two different models of web-based program review. R. Tillberg demonstrated the on-line program review tool that has been developed at LACC. Based on the model originally implemented at PCC, the LACC model links planning to budget decision making, embeds data in the document for each program area, links directly to labor market information, and contains traditional outcomes and effectiveness measures as well as evidence of effort related to SLOs. It also includes relative novel features such as documentation of "faculty engagement" and a formal "Dean's Review."

B. Vaden also demonstrated the on-line Program Review/SLO site that he has developed for LATTC. This resource was designed to provide the college with a "one-stop shop" for information needed for all academic programs. It includes a series of tabs and that link to "dashboard" outcomes measures that drill down from the department to the discipline, course, and section levels. It also serves as a "faculty portal" by providing access to course rosters and information about the academic history of enrolled students. Other features include information on occupational and labor market demand and a "cohort analysis" that tracks student graduation rates longitudinally. The system was designed to engage individual faculty and thus to drive planning "from the bottom up" and thus engage entire

departments in the program review and SLO process. LATTC started the project last summer and it was meant to completely re-invent program review as an on-line process and not to duplicate current “pen-and-paper” PR approaches. In the future, the college will work on “rolling up” the results of section and course level goals, etc. to higher levels of planning and reporting.

The DPC followed these presentations by discussing the proposal to join a taskforce formed by the District Research Committee to explore creation of a district-wide approach to on-line program review. It was agreed that such a system could benefit the colleges, particularly given the turn over of college research staff and the increasing planning and reporting requirements of the ACCJC. It was also agreed that any such district-wide resource should be offered to the colleges on a voluntary basis and should allow sufficient flexibility to be adapted to local needs. The following members of the DPC agreed to participate on the joint DRC/DPC Program Review Taskforce:

Brad Vaden (LATTC)
Jim Stanbery (LAHC)
Rebecca Stein (LAVC—in absentia)
June Miyasaki (LAVC)
Kimberly Misa (ELAC)
Gary Colombo (DO)

They will be joined by the following members of the DRC and at least one member of the SLO Coordinator Committee:

Carol Kozeracki (Pierce)
Rebecca Tillberg (WLAC)
Ed Pai (DO)
Anna Badalyan (LACC)

Review of District/College Functional Map

The DPC next turned its attention to the latest version of the draft “District/College Functional Map.” This document has been prepared to fulfill requirements established for multi-college districts by the ACCJC. G. Colombo reviewed its contents for the committee and noted that while the initial motivation for the FM’s compilation may have been compliance, it has already had a positive effect in terms of clarifying district-wide committee structures and critical district-wide administrative processes. The committee focused primarily on the section of the document that describes “The District/College Relationship” (pages 3 & 4). G. Colombo reported that during its review of these pages, the LAHC Academic Senate had recommended that the phrase “with clarity and transparency” be added to the opening line of page 4 describing the District’s role in relation to the colleges. During the ensuing discussion it was recommended that the same phrase be added to the line that introduces the roles and responsibilities of the colleges. G. Colombo also noted that the LAHC Senate had recommended that a section be added that addresses the “college-to-college” relationship. The DPC discussed the pros and cons of this recommendation and the possible placement of such a statement. It was agreed that G. Colombo and D. Beaulieu would draft some language addressing both recommendations and bring it back to the DPC by the time of the next meeting.

Viability Process Review

Given the lateness of the hour, the committee agreed to postpone its discussion of the effectiveness of Viability Review until its November meeting. Copies of the Viability processes at LACC, Pierce, and ELAC were distributed as background for this discussion. During the November meeting the DPC will be taking up the proposal that Viability Review involve a more “objective” component, particularly in the case of possible program discontinuance.

Adjournment and Next Meeting

DPC members agreed to address the remaining items on the agenda, including Viability Review, ARCC 2008 & Strategic Plan Self Inventory outcomes at its next meeting, scheduled for Tuesday, November 25, 2008 from 1:30—3:30 p.m. in the Board Room.